



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,300	06/19/2001	Glenn J. Boysko	53470.003028	9721
21967	7590	12/31/2009	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP			NGUYEN, THU HA T	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT				
1900 K STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1200				2453
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/31/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* GLENN J. BOYSKO, WILLIAM HURWOOD, BENJAMIN Z. LI,  
and ABHIMANYU WARIKOO

---

Appeal 2009-006094  
Application 09/883,300  
Technology Center 2400

---

Decided: December 31, 2009

---

Before MAHSID D. SAADAT, CARLA M. KRIVAK,  
and CARL W. WHITEHEAD, JR., *Administrative Patent Judges*.

SAADAT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the Examiner's Final Rejection of claims 1-20, which constitute all the claims pending in this application. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We affirm.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' invention relates to a method and system for integrating security and user account data with remote repositories in reporting systems (Spec. 1:5-8).

Independent Claim 1 is illustrative of the invention and reads as follows:

1. A method for integrating security and user account data in a reporting system with at least one remote repository, comprising the steps of:

enabling a user to submit user credential input to a reporting system;

identifying an authentication process;

forwarding the user credential input to a first server; and

enabling the first server to apply the authentication process to authenticate the user against a remote repository for verifying the user credential input and to determine user access control data for identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects, wherein the remote repository is located within a second server, the second server being different from the first server.

The Examiner relies on the following prior art in rejecting the claims:

Win US 6,453,353 B1 Sep. 17, 2002  
(filed Feb. 12, 1999)

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Win.

Rather than repeat the arguments here, we make reference to the Briefs (Appeal Brief filed Aug. 5, 2008, and Reply Brief filed Nov. 4, 2008)

and the Answer (mailed Sep. 4, 2008) for the respective positions of Appellants and the Examiner. Only those arguments actually made by Appellants have been considered in this decision. Arguments that Appellants did not make in the Briefs have not been considered and are deemed to be waived. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

## ISSUES

Appellants contend that Win does not disclose a remote repository that is located within a second server and the second server being different from the first server (App. Br. 9). With respect to claim 1, Appellants assert that the remote registry is not met by the repository of Win because the resources and the user information in Win are organized in a central repository and the Registry Server is coupled to the Registry Repository 110 (*id.*). Appellants further argue that Win merely teaches a role-specific access menu for showing the resources that are available to the user (App. Br. 10), which is different from the claimed step of identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects.

Therefore, the issues are whether Appellants have shown error in the Examiner's position that (1) the Registry Repository 110 of Win meets the claimed remote repository that is required to be located within a second server and the second server being different from the first server, and (2) the personalized menu of resources in Win meets the claimed step of identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

The following findings of fact (FF) are relevant to the issues involved in the appeal.

1. As shown in Figure 1 of Win, an information access system 2 includes an Access Server 106 and a Registry Server 108 which controls users' access to resources stored on Protected Servers 104 and 112. (Col. 4, ll. 33-49.)

2. Win discloses that all the components are stored and executed by one physical server or computer, or alternatively, one or more components are installed on separate computers. (Col. 4, ll. 50-54.)

3. Win describes the Registry Server 108 as part of a secure Intranet that is protected by a firewall 118 while the Access Server 106 may be located on an extranet for access by inside and outside users. (Col. 4, ll. 54-57.)

4. Win discloses that the Access Control Library manages access to the Registry Repository 110 by each of the threads executed by the Registry Server 108. (Col. 4, ll. 64-67.)

5. Win further discloses that the Registry Server 108 is coupled to a Registry Repository 110, which stores information about users, resources and roles of the users, and is further coupled by a secure communication link 109 to Access Server 106 which is coupled to network 102. Registry Server 108 has an Authentication Server Module that manages concurrent access of multiple users or browsers 100 to Registry Repository 110. (Col. 6, ll. 19-25.)

6. Figure 5E of Win discloses a state diagram wherein Access Menu Module 412 uses a Personalized Menu Service to build a list of

resources 208 that are available to the user. As shown by state 538, Access Server 106 determines that the user is authentic and requests Registry Server 108 to return a profile of the user. (Col. 11, ll. 42-51.)

7. After the Registry Server 108 returns the profile information for the user to Access Server 106, the Personalized Menu Service constructs a personalized menu of resources showing only those resources that the user is authorized to access according to the user's profile information, including the user's roles and privileges. (Col. 11, ll. 51-57.)

8. As shown in Figure 6, Win discloses that the Registry Server 108, which manages access to the Registry Repository, comprises an Authentication Server Module 606, a Registry Repository 110, and an Access Control Library 610. Authentication Server Module 606 and Access Control Library 610 provide access to the Registry Repository 110, which stores User, Resource, and Role information. (Col. 12, ll. 10-18.)

## PRINCIPLES OF LAW

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, “[a] single prior art reference that discloses, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of a claim invalidates that claim by anticipation.” *Perricone v. Medicis Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 432 F.3d 1368, 1375-76 (Fed. Cir. 2005), citing *Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Also See *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1478-79 (Fed. Cir. 1994). “Anticipation of a patent claim requires a finding that the claim at issue ‘reads on’ a prior art reference.” *Atlas Powder Co. v. IRECO, Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1346 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 781 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

## ANALYSIS

Appellants' arguments that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 1 as being anticipated by Win are not persuasive. We concur with the Examiner's conclusion equating the Access Server 106 and the Registry server 108 of Win to the claimed first and second servers with the Repository 110 being coupled to and positioned at the server 106 (Ans. 10-11). We specifically find that Win explicitly allows for the components of the access system 2 to be either parts of a single server or installed on separate computers (FF 1-2). We further find that the Access Server 106 and the Registry Server 108 are separated by the firewall 118 which places the Registry Repository 110 remotely from the Access Server 106 (FF 3). The Registry Server 108 is further disclosed to comprise a Registry Repository 110 (FF 8) wherein access to the Registry Repository 110 is managed by the Registry Server 108 (FF 4).

Therefore, while Win describes the connection between the Registry Server 108 and the Registry Repository 110 as "coupled," the reference disclosure intends the repository to be a part of the second server. Therefore, contrary to Appellants' arguments (App. Br. 9) that the repository of Win is not "located within" the second server because the Registry Server 108 is coupled to the Registry Repository 110, the repository is a part of the Registry Server 108. Similarly, we disagree with Appellants (Reply Br. 2) that Win's disclosure regarding a "central repository" indicates that the repository is not remote to system 2. Claim 1 merely requires the repository to be remote from the first server, but within a second server. Win's system 2, as shown in Figure 2, includes the server 106 which is different from server 108 that comprises repository 110 (FFs 1-4 and 8).

With also disagree with Appellants' contention (App. Br. 9-10) that the menu provided to the user shows only those resources that the user is authorized to use based on the user's profile information. The portions of Win's disclosure that are relied on by the Examiner (Ans. 12) show that the repository 110 stores information regarding the users, resources, and roles of the users (FF 5). The menu in Win that Appellants refer to is a list of resources that are available to the user and is based on a profile of the user returned by server 108 (FF 6). In other words, server 106 first determines that the user is authentic and requests server 108 to return a profile of the user, which includes user's roles and privileges. Each of these privileges relates to a resource or object. In response to the server 108 returning the profile, the personalized menu of resources is built (FF 7) which corresponds to a user permission associated with each resource based on the user's roles and privileges included in the user's profile.

Appellants' arguments (Reply Br. 3-4) merely focus on the access menu in Win, whereas each resource on the menu permits user interaction according to the user's profile. In that regard, the user's roles and privileges are initially identified for accessing each resource in the form of the user's profile (FF 6-7). The personalized access menu is then constructed according to those identified roles and privileges, which meets the claimed step of identifying at least one user permission to access each resource or object (FF 7).

With respect to the remaining claims, Appellants either repeat the arguments presented with respect to claim 1, which are discussed above and found to be unpersuasive, or present no separate arguments (App. Br. 10-22). In the absence of a separate argument with respect to those claims, they

Appeal 2009-006094  
Application 09/883,300

stand or fall with the representative independent claim 1. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii). Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2-20, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is sustained.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of facts and analysis above, we conclude that Appellants have not shown error in the Examiner's position that (1) the Registry Repository 110 of Win meets the claimed remote repository that is required to be located within a second server and the second server being different from the first server, and (2) the personalized menu of resources in Win meets the claimed identifying at least one user privilege for performing one or more actions and at least one user permission associated with one or more objects. Accordingly, we conclude that Appellants have not shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

## ORDER

The decision of the Examiner rejecting claims 1-20 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

Appeal 2009-006094  
Application 09/883,300

gvw

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
1900 K STREET NW  
SUITE 1200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109